DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 479 CG 018 636

AUTHOR O'Keefe, Garrett J.; Reid-Nash, Kathaleen
TITLE Fear of Crime and Crime Prevention Competence among the Elderly.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. National Inst. of Justice.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 73p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (93rd, Los Angeles, CA, August 23-27, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age Differences; Crime; *Crime Prevention; Demography; *Fear; *Individual Power; *Older Adults; *Self Concept; Sex Differences; *Victims of Crime

ABSTRACT

Although previous research suggests a disparity between crime fear levels among elderly persons and their actual risk of victimization, little specific data are available on the elderly person's cognitions, attitudes, and behaviors regarding crime prevention. To develop a clear perspective on the crime-related orientations of the elderly, secondary analyses were performed on the combined data from two national probability surveys conducted in 1980-81 during an evaluation of the National Crime Prevention Campaign. The total usable sample (N=2690) included 374 respondents aged 65 and older. The results of these analyses indicated that the elderly accurately saw their risk of burglary, robbery, or assault as lower than the risk for the general population. The elderly, more at risk for less violent street crimes, reported feeling less safe when out alone at night than did the general population. The elderly perceived themselves as less capable or confident in protecting themselves or others than did the general population. These findings suggest that crime fear patterns among the elderly are more realistically based than previously suggested, and that the crime fear orientations and activities of the elderly, while differing in some respects from those of younger persons, may not be incongruent with the fear levels of the elderly. A bibliography and 15 tables are appended. (Author/NRB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED263479

FEAR OF CRIME AND CRIME PREVENTION COMPETENCE AMONG THE ELDERLY

Garrett J. O'Keefe
Kathaleen Reid-Nash

Department of Mass Communications
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado 80208

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Garrett J. O'Keefe
Kathaleen Reid-Nash

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 018636

Presented to the Division of Adult Development and Aging, American Psychological Association Annual Convention, Los Angeles, California, August 1985.

Note: The research reported was supported under a grant from the National Institute of Justice.

ABSTRACT

Fear of Crime and Crime Prevention Competence Among the Elderly

Previous research suggests a disparity between crime fear levels among elderly persons and their actual risk of victimization. Largely absent have been specific data on their cognitions, attitudes and behaviors regarding crime prevention. Findings presented from a national sample survey indicate that crime fear patterns among the elderly are more realistically based than previously suggested, and that their crime prevention orientations and activities may not be incongruent with those fear levels, while differing in some respects from those of younger persons. Theoretical and policy-related implications are discussed.

Crime poses a particularly problematic issue in the lives of elderly persons, and one in which many of the pertinent psychological dynamics have been in many ways under-researched in terms of generalizable empirical data. Especially troubling have been previous indications of incongruities between fear of crime among the elderly and their actual risk of victimization, and very much of a lack of documentation as to how they go about protecting themselves from crime.

National Crime Survey data (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1981) as well as more localized statistics (cf. Skogan and Maxfield, 1981; Goldsmith, 1977) clearly indicate that the rate of victimization for citizens 65 and over is comparatively lower than for other adults, and particularly than for persons aged 12 to 25. The rate of violent crime (assault, robbery, rape) was only about a fifth of the rate against younger persons between 1973 and 1980 (BJS, 1981). However, of major concern is that the elderly appear particularly prone to crimes motivated by economic gain including an element of theft. In urban areas, the elderly have the highest rates for crimes involving personal larceny with contact (pocket picking and purse snatching), and are about as likely as other adults to be robbed (Hochstedler, 1981).

The circumstances of crimes against the elderly are also distinctive. They are far likelier than those under 65 to be victimized during daytime hours, and are also likelier to have the crimes take place in or around their homes. They are also more apt to be victimized by strangers. Weapons appear less

likely to be used in incidents against the elderly (Hochstedler, 1981).

The elderly are also less likely to be subjected to physical attacks in incidents than are victims under 65 overall, but are about as likely to be as persons between 35 and 64. They are also less apt to be injured if attacked, and the extent of such injuries when they do occur is no more severe than that for persons under 65. The aged are less likely to try to protect themselves in such incidents, even in more passive ways such as screaming or calling for help (Hochstedler, 1981).

These findings run somewhat counter to previous suggestions (Antunes, et al, 1977; Liang and Sengstock, 1980; Skogan and Maxfield, 1981) that fear of crime among the elderly is rooted not so much in a greater propensity for victimization but in the seriousness of the consequences in terms of physical injury. The economic consequences of crime can be greater for the elderly, given their numbers living on limited and/or fixed incomes.

The elderly may also be more susceptible to other forms of crime not reported in the National Crime Survey, including fraud, confidence games, medical quackery and harrassment by youths (Malinchak and Wright, 1978; Elmore, 1981).

The citizens most fearful of crime are those with typically lower rates of victimization, and the elderly are a prime example of

this paradox. Skogan and Maxfield (1981) offer some of the most compelling evidence on this in their sample study of adults in three urban areas. Forty-one percent of the persons aged 60 and over reported feeling "very unsafe" alone on the streets of their neighborhoods at night, as compared to 22 percent of those aged 50-59 and less than ten percent of those under 50. Elderly women and blacks were particularly fearful.

The conclusion that the elderly are more fearful of crime has been supported in a host of previous studies (cf. Jaycox, 1979; Braungart, Hoyer, and Braungart, 1979; Finley, 1982; Yin, 1982; Lee, 1981). What is much less clear are the reasons underlying such fear, given the lower victimization rate among the aged. Factors which have been considered include demographic ones, such as greater likelihood of living alone, having lower incomes, and being likelier to be female. However, while these variables may enhance fear among the aged, they by no means account for the overall higher level. Factors which exacerbate fear of crime among the elderly -- as well as among other age groups -- include residing in urban and especially inner-city transitional neighborhoods; residing in more remote rural areas; living in age-integrated public housing; being a member of a racial minority; having less frequent social contacts; and having previously been victimized. Largely untested have been several more psychological, physiological and sociological factors which may help explain increased fear among the elderly. For example, while generally decreased physical prowess is a fact among the elderly, the perception of or reaction to diminished capabilities

may be equally or more important in increasing fear of criminal encounters and their possible consequences. The psychological threat of decreased ability to cope with crime -- physically, emotionally or economically -- needs to be taken more into account as well (Lawton, Nahemow, Yaffee, and Feldman, 1976; Teski, 1981). General feelings of well-being, sense of control and satisfaction may also be pertinent (Yin, 1982; Normoyle and Lavrakas, 1984).

The way in which fear of crime is conceptualized and measured needs to be given more careful consideration as well. As Skogan and Maxfield (1981) point out, there are several conflicting and/or overlapping definitions of fear, ranging from perceived threat to oneself to sense of vulnerability to general concern with crime as a social issue. By far the most-used measure of fear of crime -- how fearful one would feel being out alone at night -- may be somewhat biased toward precisely the kind of crime the elderly are most prone to: street larceny with contact.

There is little previous evidence that the elderly are any more or any less involved than other citizens in crime prevention activities, nor are there clear indications of their prevention-related awareness levels, attitudes, feelings of confidence, or motivations. While the elderly may spend more time at home and perhaps go out less often at night, other factors -- such as ill health or limited social relationships -- may be more important

determinants of such behaviors than are their concerns about crime (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981).

The seeming disparity among the aged between their fear levels and actual victimization risk opens significant questions concerning the psychological dynamics of the elderly with respect to a major problem in their lives -- crime. It also poses a problematic situation for professionals concerned with enhancing crime prevention competence among the elderly and reducing their risk of victimization. Moreover, the previous research on fear of crime among the aged has been largely limited to a single dimension index of fear, and hampered by such methodological problems as use of samples of highly limited generalizability. Largely absent from the previous literature is adequate documentation of the perceptions, attitudes and behaviors of the elderly with respect to crime prevention. Without such, it is even more difficult to arrive at clear delineations of the processes by which the elderly cope with crime.

The present study, through the use of national probability sample data bases, attempts to: (1) Provide a fuller explication of the concept of fear of crime among the elderly; (2)Examine the perceptions, attitudes and behaviors of the elderly with respect to crime prevention; and (3) Relate the above findings to one another in order to allow a clearer perspective on the crime-related orientations of the elderly for both theoretical and program policy purposes.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology for this study involved secondary analyses of the combined data from two national probability surveys carried out in 1980-81 for the purpose of evaluating the National Crime Prevention Campaign (O'Keefe, 1985). The data were combined in order to yield a larger, more representative sample of persons aged 65 and over. The items analyzed here were repeated in both surveys, and the responses to them combined. While this is not an ideal sample given the time lag between the two surveys, it does have the advantage of providing a viable number of elderly respondents for analysis. The total usable sample numbers 2690, including 374 (14 percent) aged 65 and over. No significant differences were found between the 1980 and 1981 responses to the items combined and analyzed. The Comparison Sample, in sum, can be regarded as representative of the adult population circa 1980-81.

In both instances, sampling and interviewing were carried out by the Roper Organization and identical procedures were used. The populations examined included national civilian non-institutionalized U.S. residents over age 17. A one-call quasi-probability sample design was employed, based upon Roper's master national probability sample of interviewing areas. The sample size goals were 1,500 completed interviews for the 1980 survey and 1,200 for the 1981 project.

At the first sample selection stage, 100 counties were chosen at random proportionate to population after all the counties in the nation had been stratified by population size within geographic regions. At the second stage, cities and towns within the sample counties were drawn at random proportionate to population. Four blocks or segments were then drawn within each location. Where block statistics were available, blocks were drawn within cities and towns at random proportionate to population. Where no block statistics were available, blocks or rural route segments were drawn at random.

A specific method of proceeding from the starting household was prescribed at the block (or route) level. Quotas for sex and age levels, as well as for employed women, were imposed in order to assure proper representation.

Interviewing was conducted by Roper's national staff of regularly employed personnel, experienced in administering both attitudinal and behavioral questions on a wide range of topics. Their work was consistently monitored by home office and regional managers. In addition, a sample of their work was systematically validated.

For the 1980 survey, interviewing was conducted from April 12 to May 5. A total of 1,502 personal interviews were completed in respondents' homes, and the average time per interview was 50 minutes. Interviewing for the second study was carried out between November 2 and 17, 1981. Completed interviews totalled

1,188, and the average time per interview was approximately 45 minutes.

FINDINGS

Crime Perceptions and Fear

With respect to their general orientations toward crime -- including fear -- respondents were asked: (1) Whether they thought their neighborhood crime rate was increasing or decreasing; (2) How safe they felt out alone in their neighborhoods at night; (3) How dangerous they thought their neighborhoods were compared to others; (4) How likely they thought it was that they would be (a) burglarized and (b) attacked or robbed within the next year; and (5) Whether they had personally been victimized "during the past few years."

Table 1 replicates previous findings that those 65 and over are significantly more fearful than younger adults in terms of feeling more unsafe out alone in their neighborhoods at night. The difference between the two groups remains significant when the potentially confounding variables of educational level, income, marital status, employment status, household size, and type of residence (single vs. multiple dwelling) are simultaneously controlled for. Thus, the difference is at the least more a function of age than of any of the other demographic variables considered: Persons over 64 feel less safe regardless of their education, income, living situations, etc.

Table 2 generally replicates the Skogan and Maxfield finding of a sharp increase in such fear within the 65+ group. Feeling unsafe when out alone is fairly constant across the 18-24, 25-34 and 35-54 age cohorts, rises somewhat for the 55-64 group, and dramatically ascends for the elderly.

However, feeling unsafe at night clearly does not generalize to other fear-of-crime-related perceptions among the elderly. Rather, they believe themselves to be less at risk from burglary or assault than do persons under 65. And, they do not differ from younger persons in their perceptions of crime rate and danger within their neighborhoods. As expected, they report a lower degree of victimization experience (Table 1). The trend data in Table 2 indicate that perceived probability of being burglarized increases steadily up to age 64, but markedly drops after that. In fact, the elderly are the least likely of any age groups to see themselves at risk from burglary. For assault and robbery, there are no differences among age groups up to 64, and then a significant decline occurs, with the aged being the group least likely to perceive themselves at risk.

These findings suggest a rather strong congruence between crime-related perceptions of the elderly and "real-life" circumstances. The aged are less likely to be victimized through burglary, robbery or assault, and they accurately see their risks of such as lower. However, they are more at risk from less violent street crimes, and they report feeling less safe when out alone at night. The extent to which their perceived lesser risk of

burglary and violent crime is related to such factors as taking more precautions -- including possibly inappropriate ones -- will be examined later in this paper. At any rate, the issue of fear of crime among the aged is by no means settled. More exacting delineations of what "fear of crime" means to the aged -- as well as other citizens -- need to be considered in subsequent research.

Demographic Differences

In addition to determining whether the aged simply differ from other adults in their orientations toward crime, it is important to discern to the extent possible how various subgroups among the aged differ from comparable subgroups in younger adults. For example, if we have reason to believe that lower income adults under 65 are more fearful of crime, does the same hold for lower income elderly adults, given their rather special economic circumstances? The making of such comparisons is especially important in the design of prevention campaigns aimed at the elderly if we are to avoid making potentially inaccurate inferences about them based upon general population findings. We have therefore compared the crime orientations of 18 to 64 year olds versus those 65 and over on several key demographic factors. Multiple regression analyses were run to determine the relative independent impact of each of the demographic variables on the crime orientations within each age group. Demographics were categorized as being either: (1) Personal, i.e. gender, marital status, and household size; (2) Economically pertinent, i.e.

education, income, and employment status; or (3) Environmental, including home ownership, type of residence, and community size.

With respect to the key orientation of sense of danger in being out alone at night in their neighborhoods, it is clear that women feel less safe than men regardless of age (Table 3). Similarly, persons residing in larger communities feel less safe, regardless of age. On the other hand, education and income are significant factors here only among the non-elderly. Aged persons with higher education and income levels feel as unsafe in that situation as do their less educated and affluent peers. However, whether or not individuals over 64 own their own homes appears to be a highly discerning factor. Renters are substantially more fearful. Among younger adults, home ownership does not have significant impact on fear. It may be that elderly renters regardless of their income levels find housing costs more of a problem, and tend to find themselves in less desirable neighborhoods. A tentative conclusion is that such variables as income and educational background are less important determinants of fear of crime among the elderly, while the more immediate living environment may be more important. Sense of "belonging" or of being established may be less strong for renters as well.

While the aged may perceive themselves as less at risk than others to burglary, unmarried elderly persons and those living in multiple-unit housing see a significantly greater probability of such victimization, and perhaps with reasonable cause. However, once again the perception of such risk is unrelated to education

or income. Moreover, while younger adult women see themselves more at risk, no gender differences appear among the aged. Nor does community size make a difference among those 65 and over, although among other adults, the larger the community, the greater the perceived risk.

The two age groups are far more similar demographically in their perceived risk of more violent crimes happening to them. Women, urban dwellers, and lower income persons see more risk, regardless of age. The elderly differ only in that the single perceive greater risk.

Some key demographic dissimilarities also appear between the two age cohorts in their perceptions of crime in their neighborhoods. For one, lower income persons under 65 perceive an increasing neighborhood crime rate, while upper income elderly do so. Similar results are found for perceptions of current level of neighborhood crime, except that such perceptions are essentially unrelated to income among the aged. (Curiously, independently of income lesser educated elderly perceive greater crime levels.) Following the trend noted above, unmarried elderly are likelier to view crime levels as both high and increasing. Marital status is unrelated to such beliefs among other adults. And while younger women perceive crime levels as higher than do men, the gender difference disappears among the aged. For both age groups, more crime is perceived by renters, multiple residence dwellers, and those living in larger communities.

Crime Prevention Competence.

As previously, we have organized crime prevention-related orientations and activities around the concept of crime prevention competence (O'Keefe, 1985). To the extent that citizens are more crime-prevention competent, they: (1) Are more fully aware of and knowledgeable about appropriate preventive techniques; (2) Hold more positive attitudes concerning their own responsibilities for helping reduce crime, and the effectiveness of citizen-based preventive actions; (3) Feel more capable of carrying out preventive actions to reduce victimization risks to themselves and others; (4) Are more concerned about and motivated to protect themselves and others; and (5) Are more engaged in positive actions aimed at reducing crime.

The elderly perceive themselves as being less knowledgeable than do other citizens about how to make themselves and their homes "less likely to be victimized by criminals" (Table 4). They also see individual citizens as having less responsibility for protecting themselves, although with demographic controls the relationship drops to just below statistical significance. However, they are no less likely than other adults to view citizen-based preventive efforts as being effective.

The elderly fall far short of other citizens in terms of how capable or confident they feel in protecting themselves and others. They reported feeling significantly less confident about protecting themselves from crime, and saw themselves as doing a

less effective job in helping reduce crime overall. However, they are as interested in or concerned about crime prevention as younger adults, and as likely to regard themselves as opinion leaders in the realm of crime prevention. The elderly are less likely to anticipate that they would be doing more in the way of preventive activity in the future.

The aged are also more likely to credit law enforcement agencies and local officials with doing a "good job" in helping to prevent crime, which goes somewhat against previous findings suggesting the elderly regard police in a somewhat more negative light. They also give more positive evaluations to efforts of their neighbors to reduce crime, although other demographic factors appear to attenuate this finding. The aged are as critical as other citizens of the performance of the courts in preventing crime, and they rate the performances of media and prevention organizations about as positively as do other persons.

The trend-over-age in Table 5 indicate quite mixed patterns, depending upon the specific characteristics being examined. For prevention knowledge and responsibility, the elderly show a pronounced drop-off with no clear trend occurring over other age groups. Interest in prevention rises slowly with age, while self-confidence consistently declines. Perceived competence, as well as opinion leadership, peaks during the middle years. Performance ratings of police, local officials and neighbors

increase steadily with age, perhaps complementing the decline in personal protection confidence.

Demographic Differences

How citizens view and think about crime prevention is tied rather closely to a number of demographic considerations. More importantly, some of the demographic factors which may predict prevention orientations among younger adults do not necessarily do so among the aged. One case in point is how much citizens think they know about prevention techniques (Table 6). While younger males are significantly likelier to think they know more about prevention than do younger females, this difference evaporates among the elderly. While the aged see themselves as less informed about prevention, elderly women think they know as much about it as do elderly men. Also, among the elderly, married persons, higher income earners, homeowners, and multiple dwelling residents think they know more -- distinctions not found among those under 65. For both age groups the more educated see themselves as knowing more about prevention.

As for attitudes among the elderly about prevention, more of a sense of personal responsibility for getting involved is held by men, higher income earners, the employed, homeowners, and multiple dwelling residers. None of these demographic differences appear for adults under 65; in fact, it is only among the aged that demographic differences appear to be significantly related to prevention responsibility. The elderly seem far more divided on the responsibility issue than is the general public.

A likewise more diversified view is found among those over 65 on the issue of how effective citizen-based preventive efforts are. In this case, such efforts are seen as more effective by the married elderly, by those with higher education and income levels, by homeowners and multiple residence dwellers, and by those in smaller communities. For adults under 65, the only one of those factors associated with perceived prevention effectiveness is community size. Gender is also a factor for the younger population, with males more optimistic on the issue. As with prevention knowledge, however, no sex difference is found among the aged.

While the elderly do not generally differ from other adults in their levels of concern and interest regarding crime prevention, there are some key demographic distinctions. Greater concern is indicated by employed elderly, by the more educated, and by those living in housing complexes, a finding not replicated for the younger population (Table 7). However, both younger and older women exhibit increased concern. As for interest in the topic, while women and the more educated under 65 have more interest, these differences are not found among the aged. On the other hand, among the elderly greater interest is found among the more educated, homeowners, and multiple housing residents. It is noteworthy that both greater concern and interest are exhibited by lower income persons under 65, but not by those over.

On the important attribute of how confident one feels about personally doing things to help prevent crime, men and the more educated feel more confident regardless of age level. Among the elderly, married persons and homeowners feel more confident. While those under 65 living in smaller communities indicate significantly heightened confidence, community size makes virtually no difference among the aged.

With respect to citizen evaluations of the crime prevention performance of the various components of the criminal justice system, there is a distinct tendency for the more affluent to give higher ratings (Table 8). This is particularly true for higher income elderly. Moreover, urban residents are significantly more negative in their evaluations, with elderly urban dwellers the moreso. Police performance is rated higher by the more educated aged, but education is not a significant factor among adults under 65. Courts are viewed more negatively by the elderly married and single-detached residence dwellers, but not by the same groups among the non-elderly. Curiously, employed elderly are likelier to downgrade police, courts and local officials, a finding not replicated for other adults. Evaluations of how good a job mass media are doing on assisting prevention tend to follow the same pattern, but in a more subtle way.

Local organizations were viewed more positively in their preventive efforts by higher income aged, by those unemployed, and by residents of single family dwellings (Table 9). These

differences do not appear among the younger populace, where only gender was a significant factor with women rating local organizations more positively. Married citizens and home owners within both age groups rated the crime prevention efforts of their neighbors more positively. Only among the aged was higher educational level and unemployment associated with more positive impressions of neighbors' preventive efforts.

Crime Prevention Activities

Crime prevention activites were measured along the dimensions of their type and relative "cost" in terms of time and effort and/or expense. Twenty-seven activities were included in all, borrowing heavily from previous work by Lavrakas (1980) and Skogan and Maxfield (1981). For each activitiy, respondents were asked about the frequency with thich they carried out repeatable preventive behaviors (if at all), e.g. locking up the home; or whether or not they had made a specific "purchase," e.g. a burglar alarm. In the National Crime Campaign evaluation, the activities were simply organized around the concepts used by the authors noted above. For the purposes here, however, a more efficient form of data reduction was called for to allow more general cross-comparisons between age groups, and to more adequately summarize the types of activities involved. The set of items was therefore factor analyzed using a principal components solution with oblique rotation (since it could be assumed the resulting factors would likely be interdependent).

Eight factors resulted, and those are depicted in Table 10. It is important to note that the majority of factors closely parallel conceptual categories identified earlier by the above authors, and those factors have been labeled using their terms or approximations thereof. However, the intent here is not to change or challenge the previous categorization schema in instances in which a clear fit is not found. Rather, the goal is data reduction with as much conceptual clarity as possible, and the labels used were deemed appropriate in order to facilitate the specific purposes of this project.

The eight factors include:

1. Deterrent aimed actions, which include leaving on indoor and outdoor lights and using timer lights as appropriate to deter potential perpretrators.

2. Restrictive actions, referring to the restriction of one's own behavior to reduce the risk of victimization; these include going out with someone or by car to reduce threat, or avoiding certain areas completely. Taking a protective device also loaded moderately on this factor.

3. Surveillant actions, including notifying police and stopping deliveries when away from home for extended periods, and asking neighbors to watch the residence.

4. Target hardening behaviors, or ones specifically involving locking up doors and windows.

5. Cooperative behaviors encompassing getting together informally with neighbors or joining neighborhood groups aimed at crime prevention.

6. Warning-designed purchases, specifically involving engraving identifications on property and posting anti-theft stickers on doors. Burglar alarms are included as well.

7. Assertive purchases, encompassing acquisition of personal security devices and/or a dog partly for security purposes.

8. Protective actions accounting for purchases intended to protect households, including special locks, peep holes, and outdoor lights.

Differences between the elderly and other adults will be examined below for each of these factors, as well as for the specific activities comprising each.

Age Differences in Preventive Activities. The elderly and other adults differ substantially in carrying out certain kinds of preventive actions, but are highly similar with respect to others (Table 11). Looking first at the eight general factors, there are clearly more similarities than differences. The aged differ substantially from others only in assertive and surveillant actions: They are significantly less likely to own either protective devices or dogs for security purposes; on the other hand, they are more likely to have neighbors watch their houses and to have police to check in. There are no significant overall differences between young and old on the remaining factors. However, there are several meaningful behavioral distinctions in activities within some of those factors.

In the use of lighting as a deterrent, for instance, the aged are somewhat less likely to leave on outdoor lights when away at night, but more likely to use timer lights. A need among many elderly to conserve on utility expenses may well be a consideration here. Thus while young and old do not differ in general on use of lighting as a deterrent, their modes of doing so are rather distinct.

Similarly, insofar as restrictive behaviors are concerned, those over 64 are more likely to go out with a companion after dark "because of crime," and to go out by car instead of walking. But they are less likely to avoid certain places in their neighborhoods at night, or to carry protective devices. They are significantly more likely to keep doors and windows locked when home, but demographic factors (perhaps living alone) attenuate this difference.

With respect to cooperative activities, the aged are slightly (but nonsignificantly) more likely to join with neighbors in crime prevention efforts. The elderly do tend more to use anti-theft stickers, however.

The analysis across the various age groups indicates some evidence of a discontinuity in otherwise stable trends at around age 65 (Table 12). This is particularly true for deterrent, restrictive, assertive and protective activities, all of which register marked changes at 65. Restrictive activities sharply

increase, while deterrent, assertive and protective ones fall off substantially. To a lesser extent, cooperative activities fall off among the elderly after peaking for persons in their 50s. The decline in these various kinds of actions is quite curious, and needs to be explored further. A striking curvilinearity also occurs for deterrent and protective behaviors: The adults least likely to engage in them are those 18 to 24 and those over 64. The findings for the younger group might be explained by many of those individuals not seeing need for such cautions, being more mobile, etc. But the similar finding for the elderly remains puzzling.

The specific activities comprising each factor generally follow the above trends. It appears that the activities which continue to increase over the life cycle -- including among the elderly -- are the "cheaper" ones to accomplish, e.g. locking up, asking neighbors to keep watch, etc.

Demographic Differences. Persons more engaged in deterrent activities -- regardless of age -- tend to be female, married, earning higher incomes, and homeowners (Table 13). In addition to sharing those characteristics, the elderly who perform more deterrent actions are likelier to live in smaller-sized households, to be employed, and to be in larger communities.

Restrictive behaviors are most saliently predicted across all age groups by gender and locale. Women are far likelier to limit their activities, as are urban dwellers. So to a lesser but

still significant extent are single and lower income persons. Exclusively among the aged, employed persons are less likely to restrict their comings and goings, most probably out of necessity.

Across both age groups, surveillance activities tend to be engaged in more by married persons, the more educated and the more affluent, homeowners, single-detached residence dwellers, and urban residers. Elderly men tend more to take such actions, while women are slightly more likely to do so in the under-65 group.

Locking up doors and windows does not vary greatly across demographic subgroups, except for the tendency for urban dwellers and married persons to do these actions more frequently. Women under 65 lock up more often than men, but this gender difference does not occur among the aged. Cooperative prevention activity is far more common among residents of larger communities (Tables 31). Among the elderly, it is also engaged in more by homeowners living in single detached dwellings. Income does not play a sizeable role in determining extent of such involvement, but there is a moderate tendency for lower income persons to be slightly more engaged. For the aged, the more educated are significantly more likely to work with their neighbors.

The use of such "warning" mechanisms as property identifications, theft stickers, and burglar alarms is most prevalent among the

more educated and affluent, among marrieds, and among homeowners, particularly in urban areas. While gender is not an important discriminator of these behaviors for those under 65, elderly males are likelier than females to make use of these mechanisms.

The more assertive purchases of protective devices and/or dogs are far likelier to take place among males. Income, home ownership and living in single detached units also have a positive but more slight impact. An interesting relationship is found with respect to security device ownership in that persons under 65 living in larger communities are more apt to own them, while among the elderly community size is unrelated to such ownership. Special security devices in and around the home are likelier to be had by the more affluent and educated, by marrieds, by home owners, and by urban residers, regardless of age. Income is a particularly prime determinant of uses of such mechanisms among those over 64.

Relationships Among Crime and Crime Prevention Orientations

The above findings indicate that there are many ways in which the elderly differ significantly from other adults in their orientations toward crime,ant its prevention. Moreover, those differences are in many cases dependent upon a number of demographic factors and doubtlessly on more subtle intervening characteristics as well. To more fully explore the nature of these differences between younger and older, we turn to examining some of the relationships among crime, and prevention orientations and activities within each age group.

Crime vs. Crime Prevention Orientations. Regardless of age, adults who feel less safe out alone at night are more concerned about and more interested in crime prevention. But, they are also less confident of their ability to protect themselves from crime (Table 14). Thus adults more fearful of street crime are caught in a quandry of being motivated to take preventive activity but at the same time lacking the confidence that they can successfully carry those actions out. For those under 65, fear of street crime is also coupled with a perception that they know less about prevention and that citizen prevention efforts are less effective. For the younger adults such fear is thus associated with less felt crime prevention competence in general.

The pattern is quite different for those 65 and over, however. The more fearful elderly do not see themselves as any less (or any more) knowledgeable about prevention, and do not regard citizen prevention efforts as any less effective. In other words, no matter how much the aged think they know about prevention or how effective they think it is, they still feel less safe on the streets at night. Rather, their fear is clearly most associated with the motivation-confidence conflict noted above. This finding squares somewhat with our previous hypothesis that the aged are more fearful out alone at night because they rather accurately perceive themselves as more at risk in such situations. Their knowledge of prevention techniques and how effective they perceive them to be have little to do with such fear; it is more a matter of feeling confident

enough to ward off street crime when they see themselves as likelier targets of it. This suggests that if it appeared appropriate to attempt to persuade the elderly to be less fearful of street crime (which it may not be), it would be a difficult task since it would not seem to involve providing more informational or motivational stimuli, but rather boosting confidence in their ability to protect themselves.

There are more similarities than differences between young and old in terms of relationships between perceived risk of being burglarized and prevention orientations. Once again, persons in both age groups with greater motivation but less confidence tend to view their chances of being burglarized as higher. The same pattern holds for risk of being robbed or assaulted, but for the elderly alone such risk is also associated with the regarding of prevention activity as less effective. This may suggest a certain degree of "fatalism" among those aged who see violent crime as more of a threat. There is also a slight tendency for less knowledgeable elderly to see themselves more at risk from both burglary and violent crime.

The patterns with respect to perceptions of neighborhood crime rates are fairly similar to the above in terms of motivation and confidence. Notably, however, citizens in both age groups who regard their neighborhoods as higher in crime also see prevention activities as less effective. This is clearly an issue which

should be explored further with greater focus on the particular problems of high crime areas.

Crime Orientations vs. Preventive Activity. Citizens more fearful of their safety at night clearly tend more to engage in restrictive activities, as well as in target-hardening and cooperative ones (Table 15). The elderly do not differ from other adults in this regard. Persons who perceive their neighborhoods as more dangerous in general also follow the above pattern in terms of their preventive behaviors. But curiously, these individuals are also less likely to engage in deterrent or surveillant actions. The lower income of individuals in higher crime areas may help account for a reluctance to expend for extra lighting as a deterrent. It might also be hypothesized that persons in such areas are more reluctant to rely on surveillance of their houses by neighbors who may not be well-known or perhaps even suspect.

As expected, the greater the perceived risk of being victimized by burglary or by more violent forms of crime, the greater the engagement in all types of preventive activity. The aged differ somewhat from the general population in that regardless of their perceived chances of victimization, they are no more likely to be involved in cooperative behaviors. Similarly, their use of warning devices is unrelated to perceived risk of being burglarized. Both of these findings need to be studied further in the analysis of the national elderly sample.

Crime Prevention Orientations vs. Preventive Activity. There is a generally high congruence between positive orientations toward crime prevention and engagement in all of the types of preventive activity (Table 16). Regardless of age, citizens with positive perceptions and attitudes regarding prevention are also the most active in helping to protect themselves and others from crime. The few and scattered exceptions to this pattern are fairly well interpretable.

One is that persons who are either more knowledgeable about prevention or more confident in their ability to protect themselves are not necessarily any more likely to engage in restrictive activities. In fact, more confident adults under 65 are significantly less likely to restrict themselves. The implication is that more knowledgeable and confident individuals do not regard self-restriction as as viable a preventive mode as the numerous other options open to them. Interestingly, the more confident are no more likely to use target-hardening techniques. (Perhaps there could be some element of over-confidence operating here.) Likewise, those with a stronger sense of personal responsibility for helping reduce crime are somewhat ambivalent about "locking up."

The only noteworthy differences between young and old occur with respect to restrictive actions. Regardless of how confident or competent the elderly feel about their preventive abilities, they are no more (or less) likely to restrict their activities because

of crime. Since more confident younger adults restrict their activities less, we can surmise that more confident elderly may not feel quite as secure about their abilities in out of doors situations, especially after dark.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The elderly do feel less safe than younger adults walking alone in their neighborhoods at night. This fear increases gradually with age, but exhibits a sharp rise at age 65. Given street crime victimization statistics, such concern among the aged may be valid. However, the elderly see themselves as less at risk than other adults from burglary, robbery and assault. Their perceptions of the extent of crime in their neighborhoods do not differ from those of other adults.

Women across both age groups feel less safe outdoors at night, and view themselves more at risk from violent crime. Residents of larger communities also consider themselves less safe and generally are more concerned about crime, regardless of age. Single elderly perceive themselves more at risk and also consider their neighborhood crime levels to be higher. Marital status is unrelated to such concerns among the non-elderly. While lesser educated and lower income younger adults are generally more fearful and concerned, those factors lead to few differences in crime orientations among the aged. Such environmental factors as home ownership and type of residence appear more important in predicting crime fear and concern among the elderly.

While the elderly appear to have the same degree of concern about and interest in crime prevention as other citizens, they admit to knowing less about how to go about it, and feel less capable of carrying out such actions. Many of the aged also feel less of a

sense of personal responsibility for reducing crime, and this is coupled with stronger support for law enforcement agencies. Many of them also think their neighbors are doing a good job at helping reduce crime, and as a group the aged give citizen-based prevention efforts the same moderate effectiveness ratings as do other adults.

The elderly differ from other adults in terms of crime prevention competence in several ways. Generally, there is among the aged more of a tendency for married persons and homeowners to rate higher in indices of competence. Elderly persons living in multiple-unit housing also tend to score more highly. In many instances, higher income appears more a factor in prevention competence among those over 64 than among the younger populace. On the other hand, gender is found to be less predictive of certain aspects of competence among the aged. Interestingly, the elderly are more diversified than other citizens with respect to their attitudes about personal prevention responsibility and prevention effectiveness.

The aged differ only somewhat from other adults in the extent to which they engage in eight different types of crime prevention activities. The most distinct differences involved the elderly being less likely to own either personal security devices or dogs for protection purposes, but more likely to engage in such surveillant actions as asking neighbors and police to check their houses.

The two age groups also differed to some extent in the specific kinds of behaviors they performed within each of the eight general types of activities. In use of deterrent-related actions, for example, younger adults are likelier to leave on outdoor lights when away, while those over 65 tend to use indoor timer lights more. The aged also tend more to go out either by car or with a companion after dark, and to lock up when at home. They are only slightly more likely to get together with neighbors in prevention efforts.

Some substantial changes in preventive behaviors occur between the 50-64 and 65-and-over age groups, indicating a sharp discontinuity at around age 65. Restrictive behaviors tend to increase after age 64, while deterrent, assertive and protective ones drop off.

As for demographic differences, lower income elderly are less likely to use lights as a deterrent, but for younger adults income is not a factor. However, restrictive activities among the elderly do not vary with income. Women and urban dwellers are more likely to limit activities regardless of age. Income is not a factor in the carrying of protective devices; but younger women have more of a tendency to carry such, as opposed to older males.

Males across all ages tend more to own special protective devices; community size is positively related to such ownership for adults under 65, but is not a factor among the aged.

Surveillance, warning and protective behaviors occur more among the affluent and well-educated regardless of age, and elderly males are likelier to engage in such actions. Women under 65 lock up more often than men, but this gender difference disappears among the aged.

Adults of all ages who are more fearful of being out alone at night are more interested in crime prevention, but at the same time have less confidence in their ability to protect themselves. More fearful adults under 65 also regard themselves as less knowledgeable about prevention and believe prevention efforts to be less effective. For elderly citizens, however, such fear is unrelated to prevention knowledge or its perceived effectiveness; rather the fear appears more directly linked to lack of confidence. Regardless of age, more fearful citizens are likelier to engage in restrictive activities to avoid victimization, and in target-hardening and cooperative ones as well.

Both older and younger adults who see themselves as more at risk from victimization are also at once both more interested in crime prevention but lower in their confidence about protecting themselves. They are also likelier to engage in all forms of preventive activity. The elderly may be more fatalistic with respect to their chances for avoiding more violent forms of crime, and their involvement in cooperative prevention actions is unrelated to their perceived chances of being victimized.

Citizens in general who view their neighborhoods as more dangerous also tend to see prevention techniques as less effective. While these individuals are likelier to carry out restrictive, target-hardening and cooperative activities, they are less involved than other citizens in deterrent or surveillant actions.

As expected, citizens with the most positive perceptions and attitudes concerning crime prevention are also apt to be the most active in carrying out preventive behaviors. An exception involves restrictive activities: More knowledgeable and more confident individuals are not necessarily more likely to limit their activities due to crime. More confident persons under 65 in fact restrict their activities less.

Much of the previous research on fear of crime among the aged has relied almost exclusively upon the single item concerning sense of safety when walking alone at night. As many researchers have acknowledged, e.g. Skogan and Maxfield, fear of crime is certainly a more complex, multi-dimensional issue. Our data provide some further dimensions on fear and the indications are that claims of highly disproportionate fear of crime among the elderly may be exaggerated. While fear of being victimized by street crime at night certainly shows a substantial increase among those over 64, that may be based upon accurate perceptions among the aged that their victimization chances are higher for such crimes. Moreover, elderly persons regard their likelihood

of being burglarized or assaulted as being less than do other citizens, and do not perceive greater crime danger in their neighborhoods in general. These results call for at the least a rethinking of what "fear of crime" means to the elderly, and a more careful delineation of the circumstances under which it occurs, and an examination of the validity of those fears within given circumstances. There is no evidence here thus far that the aged generally "go around worrying" about crime in general any more than other citizens do. Factors which may be especially predictive of fear of crime among the aged appear more closely tied to living environment than to income or education, which runs somewhat counter to the situation for adults under 65. The direct implication for prevention promotional strategies aimed at aged citizens is that the fear issue must be handled very gingerly, and likely should be situationally based.

The relationship between crime fear and prevention competence requires much closer inspection as well. A key distinction between young and old in that relationship appears to be that the aged may exhibit greater fear regardless of how much they think they know about prevention, and of how effective they view citizen-based prevention efforts as being; for younger adults fear is related to less knowledge and perceived effectiveness. Moreover, for both age groups greater fear is associated with greater motivation to protect oneself, but less confidence in being able to do so. Thus for the elderly in particular, development of greater confidence may be a key factor. Since

increased fear is also related to greater engagement in restrictive, target-hardening and cooperative preventive behaviors among both age groups, it may be useful to examine means of emphasizing in particular the likely more productive cooperative behaviors.

The finding that citizens regardless of age who view their neighborhoods as more dangerous also regard prevention techniques as less effective needs much greater investigation as it applied to the aged. This is a target group which may need the most encouragement in realizing some of the benefits of preventive measures congruent with their own situations.

More directly addressing crime prevention competence, the elderly stand out from others as perceiving themselves as less knowledgeable and capable vis a vis protecting themselves and others, and also feeling less personal responsibility for doing so. This is a troubling mix of attitudes and one which requires greater examination. Informational and promotional efforts aimed at increasing their knowledge may not be particularly difficult, and a rise in knowledge may benefit feelings of confidence as well. But attempts at increasing their sense of personal responsibility may well be more difficult. An opening step should be to attempt to investigate what underlies that attitude. A positive outgrowth of it appears to be stronger support for law enforcement agencies, as well as a belief that such agencies as well as less formal community organizations are doing an effective job at reducing crime. One thing that may be needed is

emphasis upon getting those elderly who feel less responsible more involved with those who are "doing their part."

There are some salient differences in the particular kinds of prevention activities used by each of the two age groups, and further examination of those is needed to determine the extent to which they are either individually or situationally based. In some instances the elderly may be using techniques which are functionally equivalent to those of other adults, but which the aged may believe are more utilitarian given their circumstances, or perhaps simply feel more comfortable with. The rather sharp change in many preventive actions noted at around age 65 suggests differences based upon changes in living situations, e.g. retirement, widowhood, etc. These need to be carefully examined with more extensive measures of such situations.

These situations may determine the contraints and structures within which the elderly live. Research following the concept of opportunity theory (Skogan, 1981), which emphasizes the relationship between what people think and feel about crime and what behaviors they can take to prevent it, could provide insights into the interplay of behaviors and expectations displayed by the elderly. Opportunities for actions, determined by options and contraints within the individual's environment, need to be examined keeping the unique problems of the elderly in mind. Moreover, as Lavrakas (1980) has noted social class differences among the elderly may lead to varied methods of

coping with crime depending on the availability of material resources for doing so.

Of primary importance is the elderly's perception of these opportunities and limitations regarding crime prevention. With knowledge of these perceptions, researchers can better understand the elderly's attitudes regarding their capabilities and confidence toward prevention behavior and how they define responsibility for crime prevention efforts. Better understanding of how the elderly perceive their behaviors and of their expectations of the institutions within the community can provide a stronger working base for those concerned with crime prevention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Antunes, G.E., F.L. Cook, T.D. Cook, and W.G. Skogan. "Patterns of personal crime against the elderly: Findings from a national survey." Gerontologist, 17:321-327. 1977.

Atkin, C.K. "Research evidence on mass mediated health communication campaigns." In D. Nimmo (ed.) Communication Yearbook 3. New Brunswick: International Communication Association. 1979.

Arguri, A.F. "Police and the elderly." In D. Lester (ed.) The elderly Victim of Crime. Springfield, Ill.: C.C. Thomas. 1981.

Braungart, M.M., Hoyer, W.J. and Braungart, R.G. "Fear of crime and the elderly." In A.P. Goldstein et al., Police and the Elderly. Elmsford, N.Y.: Pergamon. 1979.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, December 1981. "Crime and the elderly."

Doolittle, J.C. "News media use by older adults." Journalism Quarterly, 56:311-317+. 1978.

Douglas, D.F., B.H. Westley and S.H. Chaffee. "An information campaign that changed community attitudes." Journalism Quarterly, 47:479-487. 1970.

Elmore, E. "Consumer fraud and the elderly." In D. Lester (ed.) The Elderly Victim of Crime. Springfield, Ill.: C.C. Thomas. 1981.

Farquhar, J., et al. "Community education for cardiovascular health." Lancet, 1:1192-95. 1977.

Finley, G.E. "Fear of crime in the elderly." In J.I. Kosberg (ed.) Abuse and Maltreatment of the Elderly. Littleton, MA.: Wright. 1983.

Goldsmith, J. "Criminal victimization of older persons." Connecticut Law Review, 9:435-449. 1977.

Gerbner, G. and L. Gross. "Living with television: The violence profile." Journal of Communication, 26:173-199. 1976.

Gerbner, G., et al. "Aging with television: Images on television drama and conceptions of social reality." Journal of Communication, 30:37-47. 1980.

Greenberg, B.S., F. Korzenny, and C.K. Atkin, "Trends in the portrayal of the elderly." In B.S. Greenberg, (ed.) Life on television: Content analyses of U.S. TV drama. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. 1980.

Hanneman, G.J. and W.J. McEwen. "Televised drug abuse appeals: A content analysis." Journalism Quarterly, 50:329-333. 1973.

Hawkins, R.P. and S. Pingree. "Using television to construct social reality." Journal of Broadcasting, 25:347-364. 1981.

Hochstedler, E. Crime against the Elderly in 26 Cities. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C. 1981.

Jaycox, V.H. "Elderly's fear of crime: Rational or irrational?" Victimology, 3:329-334. 1979.

Lavrakas, P. Factors Related to Citizen Involvement in Personal, Household and Neighborhood Anti-Crime Measures. Report submitted to U.S. Department of Justice. 1980.

Lawton, M.E., L. Nahemow, S. Yaffee, and S. Feldman. "Psychological aspects of crime and fear of crime." In J. Goldsmith and S. Goldsmith (eds.) Crime and the Elderly: Challenge and Response. Lexington, M.A.: D.C. Heath. 1976.

Lebowitz, B.D. "Age and fearfulness: Personal and situational factors." Journal of Gerontology, 30:696-700. 1975.

Lee, G.R. "Residential location and fear of crime among the elderly." Rural Sociology, 47:655-699. 1982.

Liang, J. and M.C. Sengstock. Criminal Victimization of the Elderly and Their Interaction with the Criminal Justice System. National Institute of Justice. 1980.

Maccoby, N. and D. Solomon. "The Stanford community studies in health promotion." In R. Rice and W. Paisley (eds.) Public Communication Campaigns. Beverly Hills: Sage. 1981.

Malinchak, A.A. and Wright, D. "Older Americans and crime: The scope of elderly victimization." Aging, No. 281-282:10-16. 1978.

McAlister, A., et al. "Mass Communication and community organization for public health education." American Psychologist, 35:375-379. 1980.

Mendelsohn, H. "Some reasons why information campaigns can succeed." Public Opinion Quarterly, 37: 50-61. 1973.

National Council on the Aging. The Myth and Reality of Aging in America. Washington, D.C. 1975.

National Council on the Aging. Aging in the Eighties: America in Transition. Washington, D.C. 1981.

Normoyle, J. and P. Lavrakas. "Fear of crime in elderly women: Perceptions of control, predictability and territoriality." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 10:191-202. 1984.

O'Keefe, G.J., H. Mendelsohn, and J. Liu. "The audiences for public service advertising." Paper presented to Association for Education in Journalism Annual Conference, Boston, Mass. 1980.

O'Keefe, G.J., K. Nash and J. Liu. "The perceived utility of advertising." Journalism Quarterly, 58:435-542. 1981.

O'Keefe, G.J. and K. Reid-Nash. "Fear arousal in a media information campaign." Paper presented to Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research Annual Conference. Chicago. 1982.

O'Keefe, G.J. "The persuasive impact of a crime prevention information campaign." Paper presented to American Psychological Association Annual Convention, August 1983.

O'Keefe, G.J. and H. Mendelsohn. "Taking a Bite Out of Crime": The Impact of a Mass Media Crime Prevention Campaign. National Institute of Justice, Washington, D.C. 1984.

O'Keefe, G.J. "Public views on crime: Television exposure and media credibility." In R. Bostrum (ed.) Communication Yearbook 8. Beverly Hills: Sage. 1984.

O'Keefe, G.J. and K. Reid-Nash. "TV crime news and real-world blues: A panel study of social reality." Paper presented to Association for Education in Journalism Annual Convention, Gainesville, Fla. 1984.

O'Keefe, G.J. "Taking a Bite Out of Crime: The impact of a public information campaign." Communication Research, 12:147-178. 1985.

O'Keefe, M.T. "The anti-smoking commercials: A study of television's impact on behavior." Public Opinion Quarterly, 35:248-257. 1971.

Real, M.R., H.L. Anderson, and M.H. Harrington. "Television access for older adults". Journal of Communication, 30:81-88. 1980.

Rice, R.E. and W.J. Paisley (eds.) Public Communication Campaigns. Beverly Hills: Sage. 1981.

Rogers, E. The Diffusion of Innovations. New York: Free Press, 1983.

Rubin, A.M. "Directions in television and aging research." Journal of Broadcasting, 26:537-551. 1982.

Rubin, A.M. and Rubin, R.B. "Older person's TV viewing patterns and motivations". Communication Research, 9:287-313, April 1982.

Salisbury, P.A. "Older adults as older readers: newspaper readership after age 65." Newspaper Research Journal, 3:38-44. 1981.

Schack, S. and R.S. Frank. "Police service delivery to the elderly." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 438:81-95. 1978.

Schmeling, D.G. and C.E. Wotring. "Making anti-drug-abuse advertising work." Journal of Advertising Research, 20: 33-37. 1980.

Skogan, W.G. "On attitudes and behaviors." In D. Lewis (ed.) Reactions to Crime. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage. 1981.

Skogan, W.G. and M.E. Maxfield. Coping with Crime. Beverly Hills: Sage. 1981.

Teski, M. "Environment, crime and the elderly." In D. Lester (ed.) The Elderly Victim of Crime. Springfield, Ill.: C.C. Thomas. 1981.

Yin, P.P. "Fear of crime among the elderly: Some issues and suggestions." Social Problems, 27:492-504. 1980.

Yin, P.P. "Fear of crime as a problem for the elderly." Social Problems, 30:240-245. 1982.

Young, T.J. "Use of the media by older adults." American Behavioral Scientist, 23:119-136. 1979.

TABLE 1

CRIME ORIENTATIONS
BY AGE CATEGORIES

	18-64	65 +	Sig[1]
Neigh. Crime Rate	2.27	2.29	-,-
Neigh. Safety (At Night)	2.06	2.40	c,b
Neigh. Crime Danger	2.35	2.34	-,-
Burglary Probability	1.56	1.47	a,a
Violence Probability	1.45	1.36	a,b
Victimization Exper.	1.23	1.11	c,a

[1] The second probability level is for the effect of age controlling for the education, income, marital status, employment, household size and residence type.

TABLE 2

CRIME ORIENTATIONS
BY AGE

	18-24	25-34	35-54	55-64	65 +	Sig[1]
Neigh. Crime Rate	2.20	2.28	2.27	2.29	2.29	-,b
Neigh. Safety (At Night)	2.10	1.99	2.01	2.25	2.40	c,b
Neigh. Crime Danger	2.41	2.33	2.33	2.34	2.34	-,-
Burglary Probability	1.51	1.53	1.59	1.65	1.47	b,b
Violence Probability	1.44	1.43	1.45	1.46	1.36	-,a
Victimization Exper.	1.24	1.23	1.23	1.19	1.11	c,-

[1] The second probability level is for the effect of age controlling for the education, income, marital status, employment, household size and residence type.

TABLE 3

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF CRIME ORIENTATIONS

BY DEMOGRAPHICS, BY AGE

	Danger at Night		Burglary Probability		Violence Probability		Crime Rate		Neighborhood Danger	
	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+
	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
Personal										
Gender (0=female)	-.27[c]	-.22[c]	-.06[a]	-.04	-.07[b]	-.06[a]	-.02	.00	-.06[a]	.00
Marital (0=single)	.03	-.02	.03	-.06[a]	-.02	-.07[a]	.04	.09[b]	.01	.10[c]
Household Size	.00	-.03	.00	.00	.03	-.02	.05[a]	.00	.03	-.15[c]
Economic										
Education	-.13[c]	.02	-.05[a]	.02	-.04	-.04	-.03	-.09[c]	-.12[c]	-.10[c]
Income	-.09[c]	-.06	-.06[a]	.00	-.09[b]	-.12[c]	-.05[a]	.05	-.11[c]	.00
Employment	-.05	.02	.01	.03	.03	.00	-.02	.03	-.01	.02
Environmental										
Home Ownership (0=rent)	-.07	-.10[c]	.02	.04	.00	-.02	.02	-.04	-.08[b]	-.24[c]
Residence Type (0=multiple)	-.04	-.02	.00	.10[b]	.02	.03	-.07[a]	-.12[c]	-.07[a]	-.06[a]
Community Size	.14[c]	.09[b]	.07[b]	.01	.07[b]	.09[b]	.04	.11[c]	.12[c]	.11[c]
	^{2}=.15	R^2=.11	R^2=.01	R^2=.01	R^2=.02	R^2=.02	R^2=.01	R^2=.05	R^2=.07	R^2=.08

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4

PREVENTION ORIENTATIONS
BY AGE CATEGORIES

	18-64	65 +	Sig[1]
Knowledge	2.17	2.04	c,a
Responsibility	2.13	2.05	b,-
Effectiveness	2.38	2.35	-,-
Concern	2.17	2.20	-,-
Interest	2.48	2.54	-,-
Confidence	2.22	2.00	c,c
Perceived Competence	2.74	2.57	b,-
Anticipated Behaviors	2.00	1.86	c,-
Crime Opinion Leadership	1.70	1.66	-,-
Institutional Crime Attitudes			
Local Police Effect. in Reducing Crime	2.65	2.88	c,a
Neigh. Effect. in Reducing Crime	2.59	2.74	b,-
Local Court's Effect. in Reducing Crime	1.92	1.98	-,-
Media's Effect. in Reducing Crime	2.46	2.46	-,-
Organization's Effect. in Reducing Crime	2.46	2.52	-,-
Local Off. Effect. in Reducing Crime	2.03	2.26	c,a

[1] The second probability level is for the effect of age controlling for the education, income, marital status, employment, household size and residence.

TABLE 5

PREVENTION ORIENTATION
BY AGE

	18-24	25-34	35-54	55-64	65 +	Sig[1]
Knowledge	2.13	2.19	2.20	2.16	2.04	c,-
Responsibility	2.13	2.14	2.14	2.12	2.05	-,-
Effectiveness	2.42	2.42	2.35	2.34	2.35	-,-
Concern	2.16	2.17	2.16	2.19	2.20	-,-
Interest	2.37	2.45	2.51	2.56	2.54	c,a
Confidence	2.23	2.27	2.22	2.12	2.00	c,c
Perceived Competence	2.59	2.77	2.82	2.70	2.57	c,-
Anticipated Behaviors	2.03	2.02	1.99	1.95	1.86	b,-
Crime Opinion Leadership	1.52	1.66	1.83	1.68	1.66	c,c
Institutional Crime Attitudes						
Local Police Effect. in Reducing Crime	2.49	2.64	2.67	2.80	2.88	c,a
Neigh. Effect. in Reducing Crime	2.43	2.61	2.64	2.62	2.74	c,-
Local Court's Effect. in Reducing Crime	2.00	1.95	1.86	1.89	1.98	-,-
Media's Effect. in Reducing Crime	2.45	2.48	2.45	2.44	2.46	-,a
Organization's Effect. in Reducing Crime	2.42	2.52	2.44	2.46	2.52	-,-
Local Off. Effect. in Reducing Crime	1.91	2.08	2.03	2.11	2.26	c,b

[1] The second probability level is for the effect of age controlling for the educatoin, income, marital status, employment, household size, and residence type.

TABLE 6

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF PREVENTION KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES BY DEMOGRAPHICS, BY AGE

	Knowledge		Responsibility		Effectiveness	
	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+
	B	B	B	B	B	B
Personal						
Gender (0=female)	.14[c]	.00	.01	.06[a]	.06[a]	.00
Marital (0=single)	.02	.20[c]	-.02	-.05	.02	.14[c]
Household Size	-.02	-.14	.04	-.02	.02	-.11[c]
Economic						
Education	.09[c]	.16[c]	.04	.04	.04	.10[c]
Income	.05	.08[c]	.00	.09[c]	.03	.06[a]
Employment	-.02	.13[c]	.03	.09[c]	-.02	.01
Environmental						
Home Ownership (0=rent)	.00	.21[c]	.00	.07[a]	-.03	.17[c]
Residence Type (0=multiple)	.06[a]	-.10[c]	.04	-.07[a]	.01	-.12[c]
Community Size	-.03	.02	-.06[a]	.02	-.08[b]	-.05[a]
	^{2}=.03	R^2=.13	R^2=.01	R^2=.03	R^2=.01	R^2=.05

TABLE 7

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF PREVENTION MOTIVATION AND CONFIDENCE BY DEMOGRAPHICS, BY AGE

	Concern		Interest		Confidence	
	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+
	B	B	B	B	B	B
Personal						
Gender (0=female)	-.09[c]	-.06[a]	-.07[b]	.01	.18[c]	.15[c]
Marital (0=single)	-.01	-.03	.09[c]	.13[c]	.02	.06[a]
Household Size	.03	.05	.02	.02	.02	-.05
Economic						
Education	-.06[b]	.05[a]	.00	.09[c]	.07[b]	.13[c]
Income	-.06[a]	-.02	-.09[b]	.01	.03	-.03
Employment	.00	.05[a]	-.02	.00	.03	.04
Environmental						
Home Ownership (0=rent)	-.02	.00	.04	.06[a]	-.05	.09[b]
Residence Type(0=multiple)	.01	-.06[a]	.04	-.06[a]	.06[a]	.00
Community Size	.02	.06[b]	.05[a]	.09[c]	-.11[c]	.03
	R^2=.02	R^2=.01	R^2=.02	R^2=.05	R^2=.05	R^2=.05

TABLE 8

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF JUSTICE SYSTEMS

PERFORMANCE RATINGS, BY AGE

	Police		Courts		Local Officials	
	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+
	B	B	B	B	B	B
Personal						
Gender (0=female)	-.04	.00	-.03	-.02	-.05	.00
Marital (0=single)	.07[b]	-.04	.00	-.08[b]	.02	-.04
Household Size	-.11[c]	.01	.01	.02	-.04	.04
Economic						
Education	.05	.11[c]	.00	.01	-.01	.00
Income	.07[b]	.05[a]	.01	.14[c]	.07[b]	.13[c]
Employment	.04	-.07[b]	-.06[a]	-.13[c]	-.08[b]	-.09[c]
Environmental						
Home Ownership (0=rent)	.04	.01	.00	.00	.03	.08[a]
Residence Type(0=multiple)	.05	.03	.01	-.08[b]	.04	-.03
Community Size	-.04	-.09[c]	-.06[a]	-.22[c]	-.07[b]	-.22[c]
	R^2=.03	R^2=.02	R^2=.01	R^2=.07	R^2=.02	R^2=.06

TABLE 9

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF INFORMAL JUSTICE SUPPORTS

BY DEMOGRAPHICS, BY AGE GROUP

	Media		Local Organizations		Neighbors	
	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+
	B	B	B	B	B	B
Personal						
Gender (0=female)	-.03	.02	-.07[a]	.00	-.04	-.05
Marital (0=single)	.02	.02	.03	.03	.06[a]	.10[c]
Household Size	.00	-.07[b]	-.02	.00	-.07[b]	.02
Economic						
Education	-.06[a]	-.05[a]	.03	-.05	.04	.16[c]
Income	.00	.05[a]	.02	.08[a]	.06[a]	-.03
Employment	-.05[a]	-.12[c]	-.03	-.08[b]	.00	-.14[c]
Environmental						
Home Ownership (0=rent)	.00	.05	-.01	.05	.09[b]	.12[c]
Residence Type (0=multiple)	.02	-.03	.05	.08[a]	.10[b]	.03
Community Size	-.02	-.09[c]	.00	.00	-.02	.00
	R^2=.01	R^2=.03	R^2=.01	R^2=.01	R^2=.04	R^2=.08

TABLE 10

ITEM LOADINGS ON EIGHT PREVENTION ACTIVITY FACTORS

Item	Deterrent	Restrictive	Surveillant	Target-Hardening	Cooperative	Warning	Assertive	Protective
Indoor Lights On	.54							
Outdoor Lights On	.61							
Timer Lights	.21							
Go Out With Someone		.73						
Go Out By Car		.58						
Take Device		.38						
Avoid Places		.54						
Police Check			.55					
Stop Deliveries			.55					
Neighbor to Watch			.36					

TABLE 10 (continued)

ITEM LOADINGS ON EIGHT PREVENTION ACTIVITY FACTORS

Item	Deterrent	Restrictive	Surveillant	Target-Hardening	Cooperative	Warning	Assertive	Protective
Lock Doors When Out				.68				
Lock Doors When In				.53				
Lock Windows				.74				
Getting Together With Neighbors					.90			
Joining With Neighbors					.92			
Property I.D.						.43		
Anti-Theft Stickers						.64		
Burglar Alarm						.27		
Protective Devices							.33	
Dog for Security							.52	

TABLE 10 (continued)

ITEM LOADINGS ON EIGHT PREVENTION ACTIVITY FACTORS

Item	Deterrent	Restrictive	Surveillant	Target-Hardening	Cooperative	Warning	Assertive	Protectiv
Special Locks								.53
Peep Holes								.35
Outdoor Lights								.29

TABLE 11

PREVENTION ACTIVITIES
BY AGE CATEGORIES

	18-64	65 +	Sig[1]
Deterrent	Ø.01	-Ø.13	-,-
Indoor Lights On	3.10	3.02	-,-
Outdoor Lights On	2.74	2.57	a,-
Timer Lights	1.69	1.75	-,a
Restrictive	-Ø.16	Ø.Ø5	-,-
Go Out/Someone	2.07	2.48	c,b
Go Out By Car	2.59	2.80	b,-
Take Device	1.84	1.72	-,a
Avoid Places	2.Ø4	1.92	-,a
Surveillant	-Ø.Ø1	Ø.Ø1	-,a
Police Check	1.54	1.67	a,a
Stop Deliveries	2.66	2.73	-,-
Neigh. to Watch	3.Ø1	3,15	a,-
Target Hardening	-Ø.Ø3	Ø.13	-,-
Lock Doors When Out	3.40	3.49	-,-
Lock Doors When In	3.27	3.49	c,-
Lock Windows	3.22	3.42	c,-
Cooperative	-Ø.Ø5	Ø.Ø3	-,-
Getting Together With Neighbors	1.64	1.73	-,-
Joining With Neigh.	1.59	1.64	-,-
Warning	Ø.ØØ	-Ø.Ø5	-,-
Property I.D.	1.17	1.14	-,-
Anti-Theft Stickers	1.Ø9	1.13	a,a
Burglar Alarm	1.Ø5	1.Ø5	-,-

PREVENTION ACTIVITIES (continued)
BY AGE CATEGORIES

	18-64	65 +	Sig[1]
Assertive	Ø.Ø5	-Ø.25	c,c
Protective Devices	1.28	1.20	c,b
Dog for Security	1.36	1.18	c,c
Protective	Ø.13	Ø.ØØ	-,-
Special Locks	1.47	1.46	-,-
Peep Holes	1.22	1.23	-,-
Outdoor Lights	1.47	1.41	a,-

[1] The second probability level is for the effect of age controlling for the education, income, marital status, employment, household size and residence type.

TABLE 12

PREVENTION ACTIVITIES
BY AGE

	18-24	25-34	35-54	55-64	65 +	Sig[1]
Deterrent	-0.17	0.02	0.08	0.02	-0.13	-,-
Indoor Lights On	2.95	3.08	3.16	3.14	3.02	b,-
Outdoor Lights On	2.82	2.75	2.76	2.58	2.57	b,a
Timer Lights	1.47	1.64	1.76	1.88	1.75	c,c
Restrictive	0.03	-0.11	-0.07	0.01	0.16	-,-
Go Out/Someone	2.18	2.04	2.02	2.12	2.48	c,a
Go Out By Car	2.58	2.50	2.64	2.65	2.80	b,-
Take Device	2.04	1.76	1.78	1.85	1.72	c,c
Avoid Places	2.14	2.03	1.98	2.05	1.92	-,-
Surveillant	-0.33	-0.01	0.10	0.11	0.11	c,c
Police Check	1.44	1.44	1.66	1.57	1.67	c,c
Stop Deliveries	2.27	2.74	2.77	2.75	2.73	c,c
Neigh. to Watch	2.28	3.01	3.06	3.15	3.15	c,b
Target Hardening	-0.17	0.00	-0.03	0.09	0.13	-,-
Lock Doors When Out	3.29	3.47	3.39	3.44	3.49	a,-
Lock Doors When In	3.12	3.28	3.24	3.44	3.49	c,-
Lock Windows	3.09	3.21	3.22	3.36	3.42	c,-
Cooperative	-0.12	-0.14	0.03	0.12	0.05	c,c
Getting Together With Neighbors	1.55	1.56	1.67	1.81	1.73	c,c
Joining With Neigh.	1.51	1.51	1.63	1.76	1.64	c,c
Warning	-0.15	-0.01	0.06	0.03	-0.05	a,a
Property I.D.	1.16	1.17	1.20	1.14	1.14	-,-
Anti-Theft Stickers	1.05	1.08	1.11	1.10	1.13	b,a
Burglar Alarm	1.03	1.05	1.05	1.07	1.05	-,a

PREVENTION ACTIVITIES (continued)
BY AGE

	18-24	25-34	35-54	55-64	65 +	Sig[1]
Assertive	0.05	0.05	0.10	-0.04	-0.25	c,c
Protective Devices	1.29	1.20	1.29	1.23	1.20	b,c
Dog for Security	1.34	1.33	1.42	1.30	1.18	c,c
Protective	-0.16	-0.01	0.04	0.12	-0.13	b,b
Special Locks	1.44	1.44	1.47	1.55	1.46	b,a
Peep Holes	1.22	1.21	1.21	1.25	1.23	-,-
Outdoor Lights	1.39	1.47	1.50	1.51	1.41	c,-

[1] The second probability level is for the effect of age controlling for the education, income, marital status, employment, household size and residence type.

TABLE 13

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

BY DEMOGRAPHICS, BY AGE

	Deterrence		Restrictive		Surveillance		Target Hardening	
	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+
	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
Personal								
Gender (0=female)	-.12[c]	-.06[b]	-.34[c]	-.21[c]	-.04	.06[a]	-.10[c]	-.04
Marital (0=single)	.09[c]	.11[c]	.05[a]	-.09[b]	.10[c]	.06[a]	.10[c]	.06[a]
Household Size	.03	-.08[b]	-.03	.05[a]	-.05[a]	-.10[c]	-.12[c]	-.02
Economic								
Education	.17[c]	.03	-.03	.08[c]	.18[c]	.21[c]	.03	.00
Income	.06[a]	.05[c]	-.11[c]	-.07[b]	.11[c]	.20[c]	-.05	-.03
Employment	.03	.06[b]	.00	-.09[c]	.00	-.02	.02	-.06[a]
Environmental								
Home Ownership (0=rent)	.18[c]	.19[c]	.00	-.06[a]	.24[c]	.12[c]	.02	.04
Residence Type(0=multiple)	.10[c]	.05	.03	.04	.06[a]	.14[c]	.00	-.01
Community Size	.00	.10[c]	.11[c]	.27[c]	.06[b]	.10[c]	.14[c]	.24[c]
	R^2=.16	R^2=.12	R^2=.14	R^2=.14	R^2=.19	R^2=.22	R^2=.04	R^2=.05

TABLE 13 (continued)

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

BY DEMOGRAPHICS, BY AGE

	Cooperative		Warning		Assertive		Protective	
	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+	Under 65	65+
	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
Personal								
Gender (0=female)	-.04	.00	.01	.11[c]	.05[a]	.12[c]	-.02	.02
Marital (0=single)	.06[a]	.01	.05[a]	.11[c]	.03	.11[c]	.08[b]	.08[b]
Household Size	.00	-.01	-.04	-.12[c]	.02	-.14[c]	-.05	-.12[c]
Economic								
Education	.00	.08[b]	.12[c]	.14[c]	.00	-.01	.10[c]	.07[b]
Income	-.07[a]	-.06[a]	.08[b]	.22[c]	.08[b]	.08[b]	.06[a]	.23[c]
Employment	-.04	-.02	-.01	.07[c]	.03	.08[c]	-.03	-.05[a]
Environmental								
Home Ownership (0=rent)	.03	-.06[a]	.11[c]	.11[c]	.06[a]	.15[c]	.18[c]	.13[c]
Residence Type(0=multiple)	.03	.14[c]	.01	.05	.11[c]	.10[c]	-.04	.02
Community Size	.13[c]	.30[c]	.12[c]	.13[c]	.12[c]	-.02	.09[c]	.12[c]
	R^2=.02	R^2=.09	R^2=.07	R^2=.20	R^2=.06	R^2=.10	R^2=.07	R^2=.13

TABLE 14

CRIME PREVENTION BY CRIME ORIENTATIONS BY AGE GROUP
(Upper Value Under 65; Lower Value 65+)

CRIME PREVENTION ORIENTATIONS	CRIME ORIENTATIONS				
	Crime Rate	Night Safety	Neigh. Danger	Burg. Prob.	Vio. Prob.
Knowledge	-.03	-.14[c]	-.07[c]	-.02	-.01
	-.04	.02	-.01	-.07	-.08
Responsibility	.00	-.01	-.03	.04[a]	.04
	.00	.05	-.02	.01	-.05
Effectiveness	-.04	-.08[c]	-.06[c]	-.01	-.01
	.00	-.03	-.12[a]	-.08	-.18[c]
Concern	.14[c]	.21[c]	.13[c]	.23[c]	.23[c]
	.24[c]	.17[c]	.11[a]	.14[b]	.14[b]
Interest	.14[c]	.18[c]	.08[c]	.25[c]	.24[c]
	.15[b]	.17[c]	.12[b]	.17[c]	.12[a]
Confidence	-.09[c]	-.24[c]	-.14[c]	-.12[c]	-.12[c]
	.03	-.10[a]	-.06	-.15[b]	-.14[b]
Perceived Competence	.00	-.04[a]	-.04[a]	.07[c]	.09[c]
	.03	-.08	-.08	-.02	-.03
Crime Opinion Leadership	.06[b]	-.04	.00	.04[a]	.02
	.03	.07	-.02	-.08	-.12[a]

TABLE 15

PREVENTION ACTIVITIES BY CRIME ORIENTATIONS

BY AGE GROUP

(Upper value under 65; Lower value 65+)

	Deterrent	Restrictive	Surveillant	Target-Hardening	Cooperative	Warning	Assertive	Protective
Crime	.01	.08	.00	.07[b]	.04[a]	.05	.00	.07[c]
Rate	.01	.10[a]	-.03	.11[a]	.03	-.05	-.02	-.01
Night	.00	.43[c]	-.08[c]	.19[c]	.13[c]	.00	-.07[c]	.05[a]
Safety	-.10[a]	.32[c]	-.07	.21[c]	.09[a]	-.06	-.06	.00
Neigh.	-.10[c]	.18[c]	-.14[c]	.06[b]	.08[c]	-.05[a]	-.06[b]	.00
Danger	-.14[b]	.11[a]	-.15[b]	.12[b]	.05	.01	.06	.03
Burg.	.08[c]	.22[c]	.07[c]	.15[c]	.11[c]	.14[c]	.05[a]	.09[c]
Prob.	.08	.09	.10[a]	.11[a]	-.01	.00	.08	.08
Vio.	.07[c]	.24[c]	.02	.14[c]	.10[c]	.09[c]	.05[a]	.06[b]
Prob.	.09	.11[a]	.06	.17[b]	.03	.08	.11[a]	.10[a]

TABLE 16

PREVENTION ACTIVITIES BY CRIME

PREVENTION ORIENTATIONS BY AGE GROUP

(Upper value under 65; Lower value 65+)

	Deterrent	Restrictive	Surveillant	Target-Hardening	Cooperative	Warning	Assertive	Protective
Knowledge	.12[c]	.01	.17[c]	.09[c]	.08[c]	.21[c]	.20[c]	.12[c]
	.17[c]	.07	.27[c]	.13[a]	.13[b]	.29[c]	.25[c]	.26[c]
Responsibility	.12[c]	.06[b]	.05[b]	.03	.07[c]	.04[a]	.12[c]	.06[b]
	.18[c]	.03	.10[a]	-.07	.07	.17[c]	.17[c]	.14[b]
Effectiveness	.12[c]	.07[c]	.10[c]	.10	.07[c]	.13[c]	.18[c]	.08[c]
	.15[b]	.10[a]	.13[a]	.15[b]	.13[a]	.22[c]	.22[c]	.17[c]
Concern	.09[c]	.23[c]	.03	.17[c]	.14[c]	.13[c]	.09[c]	.11[c]
	.07	.16[b]	-.01	.13[b]	.19[c]	.15[b]	.14[b]	.12[a]
Interest	.18[c]	.26[c]	.11[c]	.23[c]	.19[c]	.14[c]	.15[c]	.18[c]
	.25[c]	.20[c]	.18[c]	.29[c]	.14[b]	.23[c]	.22[c]	.20[c]
Confidence	.05[b]	-.08[c]	.10[c]	.02	.05[b]	.13[c]	.19[c]	.04[a]
	.05	.00	.10[a]	.03	.13[b]	.20[c]	.19[c]	.12[a]
Per. Comp.	.25[c]	.10[c]	.21[c]	.08[c]	.19[c]	.19[c]	.25[c]	.14[c]
	.23[c]	.03	.19[c]	.14[b]	.15[b]	.16[b]	.19[c]	.17[c]
Cr. Op. Leader.	.08[c]	.04	.16[c]	.06[b]	.20[c]	.21[c]	.08[c]	.14[c]
	-.04	-.03	.16[b]	.06	.27[c]	.22[c]	.11[a]	.14[b]